

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-18 are pending in the application, with 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 being the independent claims. Claims are amended for the sake of clarity. These changes introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that this claim is obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0081245 A1 (“Arad”) and U.S. Patent 6,675,388 B1 (“Beckmann”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,796,555 B1 (“Blahut”).

Not all features of claim 1 are disclosed or suggested by these references, and claim 1 has been amended to emphasize and clarify some of these features. In particular, the Examiner argues that Arad discloses remodulation of a channel and detection of a channel that was last used. Claim 1 as amended recites the identification of a cable channel, where the cable channel was most recently RF-remodulated for transmission on another channel. This other channel is termed “an RF-remodulated channel” in claim 1. The features of identifying a cable channel that had been remodulated for transmission on another channel (“RF-remodulated channel”) and then automatically changing a

television to this cable channel, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Arad, or by any of the other cited references.

For at least this reason, claim 1 as amended is not obvious over Arad, Beckmann, or Blahut, whether these references are considered alone or in any reasonable combination.

The Examiner also rejects claims 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16, arguing that these claims are obvious over Arad, Beckmann, Blahut, and U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2004/0068737 A1 (“Itoh”).

The Examiner’s rejection of these claims is premised on the Examiner’s contention that the cited art teaches or suggests all features of claim 1. In particular, as discussed above, the Examiner argues that Arad discloses remodulation of a channel and detection of a channel that was last used. Claim 1 as amended, as well as amended claims 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16, recite the identification of a cable channel, where the cable channel was most recently RF-remodulated for transmission on another channel, termed “an RF-remodulated channel” in each of these amended claims. The features of identifying a cable channel that had been remodulated for transmission on another channel (“RF-remodulated channel”), and then automatically changing a television to this cable channel, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Arad, or by any of the other cited references.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 2 and 3, arguing that these claims are rendered obvious by a combination of Arad, Beckmann, Blahut, Itoh, and U.S. Patent

4,566,034 (“Harger”), and by a combination of Arad, Beckmann, Blahut, Itoh, and U.S. Patent 5,900,916 (“Pauley”). Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 as amended and therefore include all features of claim 1. Moreover, the rejection of claims 2 and 3 is premised on the Examiner’s argument that claim 1 is obvious over the cited art. As discussed above, claim 1 as amended includes features not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Hence, each of claims 2 and 3 includes features not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. For at least this reason, neither claim 2 nor 3 are obvious over Arad, Beckmann, Blahut, Itoh, or Harger, whether these references are considered alone or in any reasonable combination. Likewise, neither claim 2 nor 3 are obvious over Arad, Beckmann, Blahut, Itoh, or Pauley, whether these references are considered alone or in any reasonable combination.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18, arguing that these claims are obvious over the cited art. Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 as amended and therefore include all features thereof. Similarly, claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 as amended and include all features thereof; claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 as amended and include all features thereof; claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13 as amended and include all features thereof; and claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 16 as amended and include all features thereof.

The rejection of each of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 is premised on the Examiner’s argument that the independent claims from which these claims depend are obvious over the cited art. As discussed above, each of the independent claims 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 includes features not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Hence their

respective dependent claims each include features not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. For at least this reason, none of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 is obvious over the cited art.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

GARRETT IP, L.L.C.

/Edward W. Yee/

Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: September 2, 2009

3060 Georgia Ave.
Suite 270
Glenwood MD 21738
(301) 421-1449